

### **REMARKS**

This paper is supplemental to the Amendment filed on January 13, 2011. The amendments indicated in the listing of claims presumes prior entry of the Amendment filed on January 13, 2011. Entry of the above amendments, and reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 3, 29 and 32 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 13-28 have previously been cancelled. Thus, claims 3-5, 7-12, and 29-38 are pending.

#### **Substance of Interview**

The applicants thank the examiner for contacting their representative by telephone on March 9, 2011 and for discussing the application in the follow-up call on March 15, 2011. Pursuant to MPEP 713.04, this response includes the substance of the interview.

#### **Independent Claim 3**

The applicant thanks the examiner for the indication that independent claim 3 overcomes the pending rejection. The applicant has amended claim 3 to a more preferred form but does not believe the amendment affects whether claim 3 overcomes the pending rejection.

#### **Independent Claims 29 and 32**

The applicant thanks the examiner for initiating the interview in order to invite the applicant to file this supplemental amendment. Per the discussion, the applicant has hereby amended claims 29 and 32 to move the protocol formatting language discussed during the interview.

The applicant believes that claims 29 and 32, as amended, overcome the pending rejection for at least similar reasons to those stated in the previous amendment. Specifically, the combination of Dureau, Mao, and Candelore takes two incoming signals and transcodes any and all video contained within those signals to MPEG-2. This transcoding does not depend upon the

protocol according to which any payloads of the alleged first digital transport stream are formatted. The alleged combination therefore fails to teach or suggest at least the emphasized portions of the following features:

transcoding each of the second digital payloads to be formatted  
according to a protocol that depends upon the first protocol

(claim 29), and

a transcoder configured to transcode each of the second digital  
payloads in a manner that depends upon the first protocol

(claim 32).

The rejection of independent claims 29 and 32 is therefore respectfully traversed.

### **Conclusion**

All rejections having been addressed, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: March 16, 2011

By: /Daniel G. Cardy/

Daniel G. Cardy  
Registration No. 66,537

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 824-3125  
Fax: (202) 824-3001